

Herald and News

# Editorial Page

## Not By Sweat Alone

Death and taxes are not the only certain things in the world. It is also an immutable fact that without work man perisheth—if not physically, then emotionally.

This truth has been expressed in many forms over the ages. It has now been confirmed in a public opinion poll, which, to our modern way of thinking, is the ultimate stamp of approval.

The University of Michigan Survey Research Center asked people around the country whether or not they would continue to work if they somehow or other had all the money they needed.

Eight out of ten men replied that they would continue to work, usually giving as their reasons the emptiness of a life of nonwork, the boredom of nonemployment.

Yet this apparently universal need to work exists side by side with a fairly general dislike of work. The poll also indicated that for many people work remains throughout their lives only an irksome necessity. That is, they are not doing the kind of work they think they would like to do.

Attitudes toward the idea of work were especially revealing. When asked to define work, about 50 per cent said it is something one has to do or doesn't like.

Twenty per cent described work as something productive, important, of social value to others.

Eight per cent defined work in terms of

exertion or effort. Others said it is something scheduled or timed or routinized.

Factory workers most often gave the answer that work is an activity that is timed and paid for. People with high education levels tended to consider work a duty—and not much fun.

According to Dr. Robert L. Kahn, the survey director, these attitudes are inherited from the family background. They are neither caused—nor corrected—by the educations different people receive.

Kahn sees a reflection of our dislike of work in union practices. He feels union policies say, in effect:

"Work is too hard; work is too long; working conditions are bad."

Unions, he says, have given relatively little attention to the questions of variety versus monotony, scheduling versus freedom on the job, other kinds of satisfaction from the job besides money.

On the other hand, Kahn says management has its own implicit assumptions about work:

"Work is undesirable; people won't do it unless they have to; it is something they try to avoid; pay is the only compensation for work."

It would seem that all of us, whether employer or employe, need to rethink our attitudes toward work. It's been with us since Adam; it promises to be around for a long time to come.

## Sickness Of Our Time

(Salem Oregon-Statesman)

When a six-year-old girl can't go a few blocks to a store, in the environs of Portland to fetch some groceries, without being kidnapped and killed, and when other assaults on females are common in the news we must admit that our society is sick. This was the first trip alone for Monnie Rae Minyard, but she was sure she could make it. Her mother thought she was big enough to go and get home safely, too; so she let her go. Monnie Rae never reached the store. Many hours later her dead body was found many miles away in a roadside ditch. Her relatives are bowed in grief, and a community is bowed in shame.

Do we have a general relaxing of morals?

Have sex drives become more powerful? Are our customs too loose? Are the restraining influences of religion and of home guidance losing their grip? Have we as a people become too self-indulgent, greedy for our own pleasures and satisfactions?

The moralist and the social scientist will probably say there is no single cause to this increase in delinquency; but surely the root of it is the lack of home and community discipline. Too many are abusing their "freedom," indifferent to life itself, willing to toss aside the body of a victim after fiendish tastes are satisfied. There will be no recovery from this toll of life and disgrace until home and society invoke sterner disciplines. The time to start in that direction is now.



## State Department 'Loose Shop'

By ARTHUR KROCK

(In The New York Times)  
The acridulous official comment dated Jan. 30 in which the United States Government thrust itself into the current Canadian Parliamentary debate on that nation's defense policy bears the imprint: "Department of State." So very justly the Department is being strongly criticized for one of the most ham-handed ill-conceived and undiplomatic employments in the record of American diplomacy and for the resentment in Canada of this intrusion in Canada's most vital issue of policy. This resentment will continue.

But, as is usual after large blunders have been committed in this Administration, the President and the White House have been quickly surrounded by a wide protective moat, flowing with the printers' ink that is wont to be expended on these occasions in friendly newspaper writings out of Washington. And this time the State Department is left wholly stranded on the outer shore as solely responsible for this conception, offensive wording and release to the public of this improper intrusion in Canadian internal affairs. That such a mistake could have been made by the State Department, after two years of Kennedy super-efficient government, is explained by the assertions that John Foster Dulles left it in frightful administrative disorder, and that Secretary Rusk, though of course at least a subward, just simply isn't any great shakes as an administrator. Finally, it is "revealed" that President Kennedy is "furious"—again?—over a blunder, and—again?—is going to make sure nothing of the kind can re-occur.

Different Conclusion

But this correspondent, after diligent inquiry, has what he considers sound reasons for a different conclusion. This conclusion is that the President and the White House have not only great, but final, responsibility for the issuance of the Jan. 30 statement, including its phrasing. Before the paper was released, it was "cleared at the White House." And anyone who knows anything about the dual structure of the management of foreign affairs under President Kennedy knows two things at least about the meaning of the words "cleared at the White House."

These two things are:

- (1) The White House office from which the State Department is under orders to seek "clearance" is that of McGeorge Bundy, the President's special assistant on matters of national security; and (2) Bundy knows the President's attitude on events and situations from his constant access and confidential relation. One of the explanations now being offered by those who concede these facts is that, not Bundy himself, but "someone in his office" granted the clearance and this was accepted by the department as good enough authority.

A Loose Shop

But the implication of this incredible account is that Bundy and the State Department are united in the management of the loosest Government shop, with the most important inventory, in the history of the U.S. and that they run it without resort to their employer in situations deeply and obviously affecting his interest. Though this correspondent holds that two State Departments—the head of the official one languid and comfortable on the lap of the

unofficial one—is bad administrative procedure, particularly vulnerable to blunders in its delicate area of responsibility, the results of his inquiry dispute even the modified explanation recorded above.

President Kennedy probably was angry over the ineptness that produced the anti-American explosion in Canada. But unless he is one of the very few Presidents with the humility to acknowledge in their private hearts that they are the errors being publicly attributed to subordinates—sometimes a President's own prompting—his anger was directed at some principal in this operation of the dual State Department system instead of at himself, its author.

The sentence in the release of Jan. 30 most obviously, with its ill-timing, likely to unite all Canada in resentment over the general intrusion of its sovereignty was: "... The Canadian Government has not as yet proposed any arrangement sufficiently practical in nature to contribute effectively to North American defense." Yet this survived all the official "clearances" up to and through "somebody in Bundy's office."

## Other Editors Say . . .

WOOD VS. CONCRETE

(Oregon - Statesman)

Whether due to the cost of labor, material or construction factors, the fact remains that wood apparently is priced out of the market so far as its use in a proposed new grade school at Bend is concerned.

The discrepancy came to light when the Bend School Board found its bids for the grade school and for additions to the high school exceeded the bond issue passed last fall.

Here's what the Bend Bulletin said in a recent news story: "The (grade school) building has been originally planned as a concrete block structure, but school board members, hoping to trim costs, had switched to what was thought would be a cheaper material—wood. However, bids received last night indicated that wood construction—for schools, at least—is more expensive."

"On a square footage basis, last night's bids indicated that the wood construction would cost in the neighborhood of \$13 per square foot, which was about a dollar more than the square foot cost for the concrete construction planned for the work at the senior high school."

School construction in the Salem area varies. New junior highs are of concrete and steel, largely because of roof design. And in the city itself, code requirements have indicated the use of concrete and steel even for grade schools. But in general, in outlying areas school construction has been of wood above the window base. And Salem school officials say wood construction normally is cheaper than concrete.

Not so in Bend, apparently, even though the raw material for wood construction is right at hand. And the fact wood construction was even considered would indicate that building codes were not involved. Lumbermen could well look into the Bend situation. The recent story from there isn't doing the lumber industry any good.

### NOTHING SPECIAL

(W. B. S.)

I guess this is the time of year when we take it out on the Internal Revenue Service. The district director of the IRS is the one to whom we must send our income tax forms; he is the one who collects our money if we owe a balance.

Lest we forget, however, the IRS operates under tax laws passed by Congress. The Congress is elected by us. If we don't like the tax laws, if we are either for or against a tax cut, if we are either for or against the prospect of deliberate, massive government deficit financing, let's remember that it is Congress that makes the laws and enacts all money bills.

The prestige and influence of the President notwithstanding, it is Congress and Congress only that decides what will be spent. If we don't like it, we should at least know where to direct our complaints.

Speaking of Congress—we have a tendency to cling to the idea members of that august body are a fairly enduring agency. For some it is, but a glance at the 1963 lineup shows that there is considerable turnover.

Of the Senate's 100 members, only five go back to the 1920s or earlier. Arizona's ancient Carl Hayden is the only pre-1930 member. Another 22 took office in the 1940s. That means 73 of the 100 have been in the Senate only since 1950 or subsequent election years. And 22—more than a fifth of the total chamber—date their service from 1960 and later.

There is no question in my mind that Oregon's statutes relating to the handling of publicity in juvenile cases should be overhauled to permit publication of juvenile criminals' names in some cases. I know from somewhat limited personal experience that such a situation is effective in deterring youngsters who are crime-bent.

One thing for sure—such a law impresses upon the parents of the youngsters that they should be

more watchful. Publication of his or her name might not have too much effect on the youngster involved, but it sure rouses the dander of the parents—if they are responsible citizens.

Since 1961, Montana has had a law of this kind in effect. Montana Judge Lester Loble in commenting on the effectiveness of the law, has pointed out the following facts:

1. There has been a 49 per cent decrease in felony cases involving juveniles, comparing the 18 months before the new law and 18 months after effective date of the act, July 1, 1961.

2. There has been a 68 per cent decrease in informal hearings, which are secret and are not based upon felonies.

3. There has been a 75 per cent decrease in juvenile traffic cases, which under a separate law are tried in public and are published.

4. It has re-established the confidence of the public in the court, for people now know that it is false to say that "nothing ever happens" when juveniles are apprehended and charged with crime.

5. Parents are concerned for the publicity affects their standing in the community and they are more likely to make their youngsters behave.

I can't think of anything sillier—at the moment—than the newest fad, hiking. It must make those people who have, for years, been hiking as a means of exercise and recreation, kind of sick at the stomach to see their pursuit become the butt of another American era of stupidity.

I've no quarrel with the well-entrenched idea that we must have an extensive sports program in our high schools (although I think it's overdue). But, if there is merit in the idea of taxpayers' dollars supporting sports, I think the idea could be carried over into other types of high school extra-curricular activities, such as speech and related non-hero types of endeavor.

### WASHINGTON REPORT . . .

## Goldwater Faces Big Choice For Future

By FULTON LEWIS JR.  
Senator Barry Goldwater has put off till late this year the most difficult decision of his 34 years.

The Arizona Republican, darling of his party's right wing, still has not made up his mind about a race for the Presidency in 1964. He has told supporters that he wants all of 1963 in which to "think." His decision, needless to say, is by no means an easy one.

Unlike Nelson Rockefeller, Goldwater is up for re-election next year. Arizona law does not permit a candidate to run for Senator and President at the same time. Unlike Rockefeller, Goldwater lacks the money for a Presidential drive. He does not have the high-paid ghostwriters and researchers, analysts and "experts" that work out of Rockefeller offices in Albany and Manhattan.

Begging time from those who urge that he get in the race, Goldwater might be giving the nomination to Rockefeller by default.

His friends warn that Rocky may get so far out in front that not even Carry Back could catch him. Goldwater is not convinced, however, that he could win the Presidency. He is not certain that a politician of Jewish ancestry could be elected President, even at this late date. And he does not know if anybody, regardless of race, creed or color, could beat John Kennedy in 1964.

Conservative leaders in Washington and elsewhere are convinced that only Goldwater, of all Republicans under consideration, could beat Kennedy. Their thesis, spelled out by William Rusher, publisher of National Review magazine, goes like this: 1. No Republican could hope to carry New York or California and win their 82 electoral votes. 2. Any Republican "can hold the GOP's Midwestern heartland, and such peripheral ties as northern New England and certain of the mountain states, amounting in all to perhaps 140 electoral votes." (Two-hundred and seventy are needed to win.) 3. Goldwater, and only Goldwater, can carry enough Southern and border states to offset the inevitable Kennedy conquests in the big industrial states of the North and still stand a serious chance of winning the election.

California's Bill Knowland, former Minority Leader of the U.S. Senate, urges his fellow Republicans to look to the South for electoral gains. He thinks a Conservative Republican could capture at least seven states—a total that would make up for the electoral loss of California and New York.

The Florida State GOP Chairman, Tom Fairfield Brown, feels that no one can argue seriously against the Goldwater position as the Number One Republican south of the Mason-Dixon Line. Both Mississippi and Alabama, say the GOP chairmen in those states, would go Republican if Goldwater is the nominee. "I'd be the easiest campaign I ever ran," declares John Grenier, Alabama chairman.

James Martin, the Alabama Republican who received more than 40 per cent of the vote in his Senate race last fall, agrees that a conservative could sweep Alabama in 1964, and that Rockefeller would be trounced.

Tad Smith, at 34 a former Republican State Chairman of Texas, is adamant about Rockefeller: "I am against Rockefeller because his nomination would, quite simply, destroy the Republican Party of Texas. At one resignation rally after another, lifelong Democrats now turning Republican have warned me that they will vote for a conservative Republican in 1964—but not for Rockefeller or any other liberal."

### QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q—What percentage of the world's population lives in India?  
A—India's 440 million people constitute a seventh of the human race.

Q—Did all three ships of the Columbus expedition return to home port?  
A—No, the Santa Maria was wrecked on a reef near Haiti. The Nina and Pinta reached home port.

Q—Why is Southampton, England, closely identified with the history of North America?  
A—This was the port of departure for the Mayflower and Speedwell in 1620 carrying the Pilgrims to the new world.

## THE GLOBAL VIEW . . .

### Position Helps Russ

By LEON DENNEN  
Newspaper Enterprise Analyst

NEW YORK (NEA)—Who will now deny that Nikita Khrushchev was under a lucky star? He is one Russian politician who survived Stalin's purges and has lived to see his great dream of a rift in NATO come true.

President De Gaulle's rejection of Britain's entry into the European Common Market comes at a moment when the Soviet premier is himself engaged in a bitter feud with Red China's Mao Tse-tung. He is also facing a nagging economic crisis behind the Iron Curtain.

New Khrushchev's troubles have been largely overshadowed by the tragic discord in the West. It has given the Soviet premier an opportunity to convince his Red Chinese rival and tormentor that Moscow's soft sell pays diplomatic

dividends. It succeeded where Mao's revolutionary brinkmanship might have failed. Red belligerence in the past usually forced the NATO allies to draw closer together and mend disagreements in their own camp through diplomatic negotiations. But Khrushchev's current "soft policy" seems to have lulled fears of Red aggression and encouraged the Western nations to quarrel openly among themselves.

The Soviet premier is too shrewd to open his cards at this stage in the West's discord. Judged by the Soviet press, he seeks to gain his advantage by directing his pressure against West Germany considered by Moscow as the more vulnerable member of the North Atlantic alliance.

Now it is Bonn's Chancellor Konrad Adenauer who, the Russians claim, is chief villain in the Common Market drama. According to Moscow's Pravda, the "double dealing Germans" deliberately provoked the Western crisis by playing off France against Britain.

However, Western diplomats have not forgotten the Stalin-Hitler Pact. They are convinced that the Soviet premier is negotiating secretly with the West Germans, even as he attacks them.

Is Khrushchev's long-range plan to isolate the West Germans by maneuvering them out of NATO about to succeed?

As long as Konrad Adenauer remains at the helm in Bonn, Moscow's diplomatic intrigues are likely to fail. But the 87-year-old chancellor is pledged to retire this year. Khrushchev is aware that there are influential West German industrialists and politicians who eye wistfully the Red bloc's vast markets and whose orientation is pro-Russian.

The German "neutralists" may not love the Russians. But they have just as little love for De Gaulle and the British. Russia, in their view, is also the only

power in a position to unite Germany.

It will thus require all of President Kennedy's wisdom and diplomatic tact to counter Moscow's intrigues and end as speedily as possible the discord in NATO. Time is not on the side of the West.

Diplomacy is the art of the possible. The schemes of some of President Kennedy's academic advisers to punish and "isolate" De Gaulle and revive NATO without France is bad diplomacy and completely unrealistic.

"A European alliance without France is like a wedding without a bride," a Western diplomat told this writer.

France is a key European power and essential to the defense of the West. De Gaulle cannot be discredited by President Kennedy's New Frontiersmen as another Napoleon. As long as he guides French policy he cannot be isolated or ignored.

President Kennedy would be wise to find a face-saving gimmick for a meeting with De Gaulle when he visits Italy and West Germany in the spring. An agreement with the French president should be the primary aim of U.S. diplomacy.

Admittedly De Gaulle is a difficult and stubborn man who clings to his preposterous vision of France's "grandeur" in the Atomic Age. It will take time, effort and patience to convince him that he made a mistake in attempting to keep Britain out of the Common Market. But if we can negotiate with Khrushchev, surely we can negotiate with De Gaulle.

The purpose of any diplomatic negotiations is to reconcile different national interests. This is especially true of allies faced with a common enemy.

A trial of strength between the 72-year-old De Gaulle and the 43-year-old Kennedy can only end in a victory for Premier Khrushchev.



### Thailand

- ACROSS: 1 Thailand's former name 5 — is one of its mineral resources 8 Its staple — is rice 12 Ozone 13 Chemical suffix 14 Ireland 15 Mascotine appellation 16 European mountain 17 Tartar lacer (var.) 18 Jaybird (Scot.) 19 Notions 21 Abstract being 22 Heating device 24 This country has many — forests 26 Sit again 28 Tauter 29 Greek letter
- DOWN: 30 Legal point 31 2050 (Roman) 32 Brazilian waiaba 33 Unspoken 36 Gasoline (Brit.) 40 Miraculous food of Israelites 41 Female ruff 42 Hawaiian herb 43 Memoranda 47 Vegetable 48 Miss Chase 50 Name (Fr.) 51 Fish 52 Bamboo-like grass 53 In three ways (comb. form) 54 Assistant 55 Icelandic saga 56 Over (contr.) 57 Trampled many — 1 Vocalist 2 Fancy 3 Foreigners

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12				13				14		
15				16				17		
18			19				20		21	
22			23				24		25	
26							27			
28							29			
30							31			
32							33			
34							35			
36							37		38	39
40							41			
42				43	44	45	46		47	
48				49		50			51	
52				53					54	
55				56					57	

### Answer to Previous Puzzle

- 4 Honey 27 Vended 8 Leaping 28 Snare 9 Amphibian 33 Referee 8 Land tenure 37 Mend 7 genus of water breeds 35 Twisted 11 Thicker 38 Exaggerate 10 Fruit 44 Preparation 11 Thicker 45 Ripped 19 Panamanian 46 Prince 20 Sneezers 49 City in Oklahoma 21 Aviator 51 Felina 25 Hamlet

## Almanac

By United Press International

Today is Sunday, Feb. 17, the 48th day of 1963 with 417 to follow. The moon is approaching its new phase.

The morning star is Venus. The evening stars are Mars, Saturn and Jupiter.

On this day in history: In 1817, for the first time in American history, a city street was illuminated by gas lights in Baltimore.

In 1906, Alice Roosevelt, oldest daughter of President Theodore Roosevelt, was married in the East Room of the White House. In 1944, American soldiers landed on the Japanese-held base of Eniwetok in the Marshall Islands.

A thought for the day — Irish playwright George Bernard Shaw said: "We have no more right to consume happiness without producing it than to consume wealth without producing it."